

6



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/005,479 01/12/98 LEVERGOOD

T OMI95-01A

021005 TM02/0731
HAMILTON BROOK SMITH AND REYNOLDS, P.C.
TWO MILITIA DR
LEXINGTON MA 02421-4799

EXAMINER

WINDER, P	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2155
DATE MAILED:

07/31/01

22

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/005,479

Applicant(s)

Levergood et al.

Examiner
Patrice L. Winder

Art Unit
2155



– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on May 17, 2001
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 5-26, 31-43, 49-63, 67-93, 96-98, 100-106, and 108-111 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 5-26, 31-43, 49-63, 67-93, 96-98, 100-106, and 108-111 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirements.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 20 20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2155

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 3, 5-26, 31-43, 49-63, 67-93 and 96-98, 100-106, 108-111 are pending.
2. A collective statement of motivation for combination concludes each section of the rejection.

Specification

3. The attempt to incorporate subject matter into this application by reference to Payne et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,715,314 is improper because it is not accompanied by an affidavit or declaration executed by the applicant, see MPEP 608.01(p).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code 103(a) not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
5. Claims 3, 5-6, 13-14, 23, 25, 31-32, 35-38, 49-54, 56-62, 67-74, 77, 79- 85, 87-93, 101-102, 104 and 106 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjorn N. Freeman-Benson ,“Using the Web to Provide Private Information -or- A Short Paper About Password Protection Without Client Modifications” (hereafter referred to as Freeman-Benson) in view of Johnson et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,560,008 (hereafter referred to as Johnson).

Art Unit: 2155

6. Regarding claim 3, Freeman-Benson taught a method of processing service requests from a client to a server system through a network comprising:

forwarding a service request from the client to the server system, wherein the communications between the client and server system are according to hypertext transport protocol (para 11, pgs 2-3);

returning a session identifier from the server system to the client (returning specialized URL, para 16, pg 3); the client storing the session identifier for use in subsequent communications (bookmarking the specialized URL, para 16, pg. 3); and

the session identifier appended to subsequent service requests from the client to the server system within a session of requests (paras 12, 16, pg 3).

Freeman-Benson does not specifically teach appending a session identifier to service requests. However, Johnson taught appending a session identifier to subsequent service requests (col. 5, line 66 - col. 6, line 2, inserting following each request, col.9, lines 33-39).

7. Regarding dependent claim 5, Johnson taught the session identifier (credential id) includes a user identifier (col. 5, lines 56-60).

8. Regarding dependent claim 6, Freeman-Benson does not specifically disclose wherein the session identifier (credential id) includes an expiration time for the session. However, Johnson does disclose that the authentication is valid within an expiration time (col. 6, lines 38-43, 51-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the expiration time in the session id because doing so would improve efficiency by not

Art Unit: 2155

requiring the server to request the expiration time before validating the session identifier (credential id).

9. Regarding dependent claim 13, Johnson taught the server system assigns the session identifier (credential id) to an initial service request to the server system (if credential id not included in request, col. 6, lines 11-14, 31-34).

10. Regarding dependent claim 14, Johnson taught the server system subjects the client to an authorization routine prior to issuing the session identifier (credential id) and the session identifier (credential id) is protected from forgery (col. 6, lines 31-36, 47-50).

11. Regarding dependent claim 23, Johnson the access rights of the client are fully contained within the session identifier (col. 8, lines 32-38).

12. Regarding dependent claim 25, Freeman-Benson taught a service request is for a document which has been purchased by the user (access to the private database is purchased, paragraph 2). Johnson taught the session identifier comprises an authorization identifier (privilege field), and further comprising:

returning the requested document if the authorization identifier indicates that the user is authorized to access the document (col. 8, lines 15-22).

13. Regarding dependent claim 31, Freeman -Benson taught at least one service request comprises a document request for a document (search request, para 11, pg 2) which has been purchased by a user (user charged for access to private database, para 2, pg 1). Johnson taught wherein the session identifier comprises an authorization identifier (inserting credential id

Art Unit: 2155

including privilege field, col.5, line 66 - col. 6, line 2, col. 9, lines 33-39), the method further comprising: returning the requested document if the authorization identifier indicates the user is authorized to access the document (col. 7, lines 46-53, col. 8, lines 18-22).

14. Regarding dependent claim 32, Johnson taught the authorization identifier is encoded within a session identifier which is appended to the requested (col. 9, lines 6-16).

15. Regarding claim 35, Freeman-Benson taught an information system on a network, comprising:

means for receiving service requests from client and for determining whether a service request includes a session identifier wherein communications to and from the clients are according to hypertext transfer protocol (para 19, pg 4);

means for providing the session identifier in response to an initial service request in a session of requests (para 11, pgs 2-3);

means for providing the session identifier in response to an initial service request in a session of requests (para 12, pg 3);

means for servicing subsequent services requests from a client, the subsequent service requests including the session identifier (paras 20-21, pg 4); and

means for storing, at the client, the session identifier for use in each communication associated with the document request (bookmarking the specialized URL, para 16, pg. 3).

Freeman-Benson does not specifically teach subsequent service requests within a session of requests. However, Johnson taught subsequent service requests within a session of requests

Art Unit: 2155

(col. 6, lines 41-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that incorporating Johnson's subsequent service requests within a session of requests in Freeman-Benson's system for accessing a private web database would have improved system efficiency. The motivation would have been to enable the web server to limit the validity of the session identifier to a length of time, i.e. corresponding to a session, and thereby improve system security.

16. Regarding dependent claim 36, Johnson taught the access rights of the client are fully contained within the session identifier (col. 8, lines 32-38).

17. Regarding dependent claim 37, Freeman-Benson taught the means for providing the session identifier is in a server system which services the requests (para 11, pgs 2-3, web server in system with several nodes, paras 19-21, pg 4).

18. Regarding dependent claim 49, Freeman-Benson taught the session identifier is cryptographically generated (encrypted version of login name and password appended to URL, para 9, pg 2).

19. Regarding dependent claim 50, Johnson taught further comprising:

returning a response to the client (client authentication agent constructs credentials), the response redirecting an initial service request to an authentication server (redirect the client request to authentication agent), the authentication server providing the session identifier (authentication agent of server providing credential id, col. 9, lines 45-52).

Art Unit: 2155

20. Regarding dependent claim 51, Freeman-Benson taught wherein the session identifier is appended to at least one path name in a document returned by the server system (encrypted version of login name and password appended to URL, para 9, pg 2).
21. Regarding dependent claim 52, Freeman-Benson taught the at least one path name is a link in the returned document (appended to URL, para 8, pg 2).
22. Regarding dependent claim 53, Freeman-Benson taught the link is an absolute link (URL with designated path name, para 8, pg. 2).
23. Regarding dependent claim 54, Freeman-Benson taught the link comprises a uniform resource locator (special URL, para 9, pg 2).
24. Regarding dependent claim 56, Freeman-Benson taught the session identifier is cryptographically generated (encrypted version of login name and password appended to URL, para 9, pg 2).
25. Regarding dependent claim 57, Johnson taught the session identifier is directed to an accessible domain (group set field, col. 8, lines 14-15).
26. Regarding dependent claim 58, Freeman-Benson does not specifically disclose wherein the session identifier (credential id) includes an expiration time for the session. However, Johnson does disclose that the authentication is valid within an expiration time (col. 6, lines 38-43, 51-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the expiration time in the session id because doing so would improve efficiency by not

Art Unit: 2155

requiring the server to request the expiration time before validating the session identifier (credential id).

27. Regarding dependent claim 59, Johnson taught the session identifier comprises a date (col. 6, lines 41-45).

28. Regarding dependent claim 60, Johnson taught the session identifier comprises a key identifier (index, col. 8, lines 8-9).

29. Regarding dependent claim 61, Johnson taught the session identifier comprises an address of the client (location of user in group id, col. 8, lines 11-12).

30. Regarding dependent claim 62, Johnson taught the session identifier comprises an unforgeable digital signature (col. 9, lines 16-20).

31. Regarding dependent claim 67, Freeman-Benson taught the session identifier is designated by the server system (session identifier returned in link, para 11, pgs 2-3), further comprising the steps of:

validating, at the server system, the appended session identifier (KeyVerifierNode validating encrypted portion of special URL, para 21, pg 4);

returning a controlled document if the appended session identifier is valid (returning the document, para 19, pg 4).

32. Regarding claim 79, Freeman-Benson taught a method of processing service requests from a client to a server system through a network,

Art Unit: 2155

forwarding the service request from the client to the server system, wherein the communications between the client and server system are according to hypertext transfer protocol (para 11, pgs 2-3);

returning a session identifier from the server system to the client (returning specialized URL, para 16, pg 3), the client storing the session identifier for use in subsequent communications (bookmarking the specialized URL, para 16, pg. 3);

appended as part of a path name in a uniform resource locator the session identifier to subsequent service requests from the client to the service system within a session requests (paras 12,16, pg 3).

Freeman-Benson does not specifically teach appended as part of a path name in a uniform resource locator the session identifier to subsequent service requests. However, Johnson taught appending the session identifier to subsequent service requests (col. 5, line 66 - col. 6, line 2, inserting, col. 9, lines 33-39).

33. Regarding dependent claim 101, Johnson taught the session identifier is appended by the client (col. 9, lines 33-39).

34. Regarding dependent claim 102, Freeman-Benson taught the session identifier is cryptographically generated (encrypted version of login name and password appended to URL, para 9, pg 2).

35. Regarding dependent claim 104, Freeman-Benson taught the document is returned electronically (inherent, web server returning document requested by URL, para 19, pg 4).

Art Unit: 2155

36. Regarding dependent claim 106, Freeman-Benson taught the authorization identifier is appended to a uniform resource locator (specialized URL, para 8, pg. 2).

37. Regarding dependent claim 108, Freeman-Benson taught a service request is a request to purchase a product (access to the private database is purchased, paragraph 2).

38. Regarding dependent claim 109, Freeman-Benson taught the product is transmitted over a network (Grades transmitted to student over a Internet/Intranet, para 16, pg. 3).

39. Regarding dependent claim 110, Freeman-Benson does not specifically teach the product is a newspaper/newsletter article. "Official notice" is taken that newspaper articles are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that incorporating a newspaper/newsletter article in Freeman-Benson's system for accessing a private web database would have improved system marketability. The motivation would have been to provide public information to a requestor in an improved interface.

40. Regarding dependent claim 111, Freeman-Benson does not specifically teach the product is a durable product. "Official notice" is taken that providing durable products is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that incorporating a durable product in Freeman-Benson's system for accessing a private web database would have improved system effectiveness. The motivation would have been to enable ordering of a wider range of products.

41. Regarding the motivation for claims 1 and 79, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that substituting Johnson's appending a

Art Unit: 2155

session identifier to subsequent request in Freeman-Benson's system for accessing a private web database would have improved system effectiveness. The motivation would have been to improve upon Freeman-Benson method of authentication by incorporating authorization.

42. Claims 7-12, 24-26, 33-34, 39-43, 55, 76, 78 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman-Benson and Johnson further in view of Filepp et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,347,632 (hereafter referred to as Filepp).

43. Regarding dependent claim 7, Freeman-Benson does not specifically teach the server system recording a transaction log. However, Filepp taught a method wherein the server system records information in a transaction log in the server system (col. 9, lines 38-44).

44. Regarding dependent claim 8, Freeman-Benson does not specifically teach the server tracking the access history of the session. However, Filepp taught a server system that tracks the access history of sequences of service requests within a session of requests (col. 9, lines 38-44).

45. Regarding dependent claim 9, Freeman-Benson does not specifically teach the server system tracking the access history to determine requests leading to purchases. However, Filepp taught the server system tracking the access history to determine requests leading to purchases (col. 9, lines 27-43).

46. Regarding dependent claim 10, Freeman-Benson does not specifically teach a server system counting the requests. However, Filepp taught a server system counts requests to particular services exclusive of repeated requests from a common client (col. 9, lines 41-44).

Art Unit: 2155

47. Regarding dependent claim 11, Freeman-Benson does not specifically teach a database relating customer information to access patterns. However, Filepp taught the server system maintains a database relating customer information to access patterns (col. 93, lines 28-43).

48. As per dependent 12, Freeman-Benson does not specifically teach information that includes customer demographics. However, Filepp taught wherein the information includes customer demographics (col. 9, lines 38-44).

49. Regarding dependent claim 24, Johnson taught a service request is for a document (request to open a file) and the session identifier includes a user identification (user id, col. 8, lines 10-11), further comprising:

returning the requested document wherein the document (returning an opened file, col. 7, lines 46-53). Johnson does not specifically teach the document is customized for a particular user based on the user identification of the session identifier. However, Filepp taught the document is customized for a particular user based on the user identification of the session identifier (col. 9, lines 38-44).

50. Regarding dependent claim 26, Johnson taught a service request is for a document (request to open a file) wherein the session identifier comprises a user identifier (user id, col. 8, lines 10-11), further comprising:

returning the requested document to the client (receiving open file, col. 7, lines 46-53). Johnson does not specifically teach charging the user identified in the identifier for access to the

Art Unit: 2155

document. However, Filepp taught charging the user identified in the identifier for access to the document (col. 6, lines 57-61).

51. Regarding dependent claim 33, Johnson taught at least one service request comprises a request for a document (request to open file), wherein the session identifier is designated by the server system (credential id specified by server system), said method comprising :

returning the requested document to the client (col. 5, lines 66 - col. 6, line 2).

Johnson does not specifically teach charging the user identified in the session identifier for access to the document. However, Filepp taught charging the user identified in the session identifier for access to the document (col. 6, lines 57-61).

52. Regarding dependent claim 34, Johnson taught a user identifier is encoded within a session identifier which is appended to the request (user id, col. 8, lines 10-11, inserted following request, col. 9, lines 33-39).

53. Regarding dependent claim 55, Johnson does not specifically teach the step of appending the session identifier comprises filtering the requested document. However, Filepp taught filtering the requested document (filtering by customizing the document, col. 9, lines 38-44)

54. Regarding dependent claim 76, Freeman-Benson does not specifically teach the document is customized for a particular based on user identification of the session identifier. However, Filepp taught the document is customized for a particular based on user identification of the session identifier (col. 9, lines 38-44).

Art Unit: 2155

55. Regarding claims 7, 10-11, 24, 26, 33, 39-42, 55, 76, 78, 86, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that incorporating Filepp's tracking methodology in Freeman-Benson's system for accessing a private web database would have improved system utility. The motivation would have been to increase the marketability and flexibility of Freeman-Benson's system by enabling the service providers to be more responsive to clients.

56. Claims 15- 21, 63 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman-Benson and Johnson further in view of Cheng et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,544,322 (hereafter referred to as Cheng).

57. Regarding dependent claim 15, Freeman-Benson does not specifically teach plural servers. However, Cheng taught plural servers including an authentication server which provides session identifier (credential id)s for service requests to multiple servers (Figure 2, col. 5).

58. Regarding dependent claim 16, Johnson taught a method wherein a client directs a service request to a first server which is to provide the requested service;

the first server checks the service request for a session identifier (credential id) and only services a request having a valid session identifier (credential id),

and where the service request has no valid identifier, the first server redirects the service request from the client to the authorization server (authentication agent);

Art Unit: 2155

the authorization server (authentication agent) subjects the client to the authorization routine and issues the session identifier (credential id) to be appended to the service request to the first server;

the client forwards the service request appended with the session identifier (credential id) to the first server;

the first server recognizes the session identifier (credential id) and services the service request to the client; and,

the client appends the session identifier (credential id) to subsequent service requests to the server system and is serviced without further authorization. Benson does not specifically teach an authorization server. However, Cheng taught a client, a first server, and an authorization server (Figure 2, col. 5).

59. Regarding dependent claim 17, Johnson taught a method wherein the session identifier (credential id) includes a user identifier (col. 5, lines 56-60).

60. Regarding dependent claim 18, Johnson taught the session identifier (credential id) has an expiration time. Johnson does not disclose the session identifier (credential id) includes an expiration time for the session. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate an expiration time for the session in session identifier (credential id) because including the expiration time in the session identifier (credential id) would increase efficiency by not requiring the server to request the expiration time before validating an authorization.

Art Unit: 2155

61. Regarding dependent claim 19, Johnson taught the session identifier (credential id) provides access to a protected domain to which the session has access authorization (col. 13, lines 37-40).

62. Regarding dependent claim 20, Johnson taught the session identifier is modified for access to a different protected domain (col. 8, lines 32-38).

63. Regarding dependent claim 21, Johnson taught the session identifier (credential id) provides a key identifier for key management (col. 5, lines 56-60).

64. Regarding dependent claim 63, Freeman-Benson does not specifically teach the authorization identifier is provided by an authentication server. However, Cheng taught the authorization identifier is provided by an authentication server (col. 5, lines 31-34, 36-39).

65. Regarding dependent claim 75, Freeman-Benson does not specifically teach the session identifier facilitates authenticated accesses across multiple servers. However, Cheng taught the session identifier facilitates authenticated accesses across multiple servers (Figure 2, col. 5).

66. Regarding claims , it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Cheng's multiple server system in Freeman-Benson's system for accessing a private web database because doing so would have increased system utility. The motivation would have been to increase flexibility by enabling the service providers to authorize more clients to access protected domains.

67. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman-Benson, Johnson and Cheng further in view of Filepp.

Art Unit: 2155

68. Regarding dependent claim 22, Freeman-Benson does not specifically teach a transaction log in the server system. However, Filepp taught a method wherein the server system records information from the session identifier (credential id) in a transaction log in the server system (col. 9, lines 38-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that incorporating Filepp's tracking methodology in Freeman-Benson's system for accessing a private web database would have improved system utility. The motivation would have been to increase the marketability and flexibility of Freeman-Benson's system by enabling the service providers to be more responsive to clients.

69. Claims 96-98, 100, 103 and 105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman-Benson in view of Dedrick, U.S. Patent No. 5,768,521 (hereafter referred to as Dedrick).

70. Regarding dependent claim 96, Freeman-Benson does not specifically teach how a user is charged. However, Dedrick taught servicing a request (col. 3, lines 50-56); and automatically charging a user identified by the session identifier for the service provided (col. 3, lines 60-63).

71. Regarding dependent claim 97, Freeman-Benson does not specifically teach how a user makes a purchase request. However, Dedrick taught at least one service request comprises a purchase request (review of the request indicates the user is not a subscriber), the purchase request including an associated user identifier (request includes information identifying whether the user is a subscriber), the method further comprising:

Art Unit: 2155

accessing, upon receipt of the purchase request at the server system, user information associated with the user identifier sufficient to charge an account associated with the user the purchase price of the product identified by the purchase request (col. 3, lines 31-41, 60-63);

charging the user for the product identified by the purchase request according to the user information (col. 7, lines 29-35); and

fulfilling the purchase request based on the user information (col. 7, lines 35-37).

72. Regarding dependent claim 98, Johnson taught the client includes the user identifier in a session identifier (user id, col. 8, lines 11-12). Freeman-Johnson taught the session identifier appended to the purchase request (request to purchase private information para 2, pg.).

73. Regarding dependent claim 100, Freeman-Benson does not specifically teach how the user makes a purchasing request. However, Dedrick taught under control of a client system,

displaying information identifying a product (col. 7, lines 18-23); and

in response to a user selection of a hyperlink (inherent, information distributed according to hypertext markup language, col. 4, lines 36-38) associated with a product desired to be purchased, sending a request to purchase the item along with an identifier of a purchaser of the item to a server system (id whether client is a subscriber, col. 7, lines 18-26); and

under the control of the server system,

upon receiving the request, retrieving additional information previously stored for the purchaser identified by the identifier in the received request (retrieving profile containing account information, col. 3, lines 31-41, 60-63);

Art Unit: 2155

charging the user the purchase price of the product (metering server debits the user account, col. 7, lines 32-37); and

fulfilling the request for the product (sending information, col. 7, lines 32-37).

74. Regarding dependent claim 103, Freeman-Benson does not specifically teach how a user is charged. However, Dedrick taught identifying the user from the authorization identifier (identifying subscriber authorization, col. 3, lines 50-56); and

automatically charging the identified user for the document (col. 3, lines 60-63).

75. Regarding dependent claim 105, Freeman-Benson does not specifically teach a physical copy of the document is sent. However, Dedrick taught a physical copy of the document is sent (through the purchasing options the user is able to retrieve requested information by printing, i.e. physical copy, col. 3, lines 25-27).

76. Regarding claims 96, 97, 100, 103, 105, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that incorporating Dedrick's metering mechanisms for charging users for electronic information in Freeman-Benson's system for accessing a private web database would have improved system effectiveness. The motivation would have to provide a mechanism to allow a system to automatically debit and bill a user for consuming requested electronic information from the web database (Dedrick, col. 1, lines 54-56).

Statements concerning the remaining claims

Art Unit: 2155

77. The language of claims 38-43 is substantially equivalent to the language of previously rejected claims 14, 7-8, 10-12. Therefore, claims 38-43 are rejected on the same rationale as claims 14, 7-8, 10-12, respectively.

78. The language of claims 68 -74 is substantially equivalent to the language of previously rejected claims 56-62. Therefore, claims 68-74 are rejected on the same rationale as claims 56-62, respectively.

79. The language of claims 77-78 is substantially equivalent to the language of previously rejected claims 51 and 55. Therefore, claims 77-78 are rejected on the same rationale as claims 51 and 55, respectively.

80. The language of claims 80-93 is substantially equivalent to the language of previously rejected claims 49-62. Therefore, claims 80-93 are rejected on the same rationale as claims 49-62, respectively.

Conclusion

81. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Dasan, U.S. Patent No. 5,761,662: taught a personalized information retrieval using user-defined profile (e.g. personalized newspaper);

Art Unit: 2155

- b. Montulli, U.S. Patent No. 5,774,670: taught persistent client state in a hypertext transfer protocol based client-server system;
- c. Montulli, U.S. Patent No. 5,826,242: taught method of on-line shopping utilizing persistent client-state in a hypertext transfer protocol based client-server system;
- d. Montulli, U.S. Patent No. 6,134,592: taught a persistent client state in a hypertext transfer protocol based client-server system; and
- e. Trip et al., "Cookies" (client-side persistent information) and their use, Netscape Technical Note 20019: a "cookie" is a small piece of information which a web server (via a CGI script) can store with a web browser and later read back from that browser.

82. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2155

83. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrice Winder whose telephone number is (703) 305-3938. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 10:30 AM to 7:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh, can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-9052.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Patrice Winder". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped initial "P".

Patrice Winder
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2155